

Date: Sun, 4 Apr 93 04:30:14 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #85
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sun, 4 Apr 93 Volume 93 : Issue 85

Today's Topics:

 Just waiting the OFs out
 No-code issue

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sun, 4 Apr 1993 06:48:38 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Just waiting the OFs out
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Fortunately for those of us that believe the code requirements are
little more than antiquated hazing practices, time and soon numbers are
on our side. The no-code license is currently the entry license of
choice. I seriously doubt that all these new amateurs will turn around
and suggest that the no-code license be eliminated. In fact, I predict
they will advocate further reduction in code requirements and greater
licensing requirements in technical and operating areas. As the new
blood replaces the old, the numbers will eventually be there to make
further licensing changes.

It's all a matter of time.

73,
Todd
N9MWB Started out as a no-coder and proud of it.

Date: Sun, 4 Apr 1993 06:48:46 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: No-code issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

And Brett, before you start, I think code is a wonderful means of communication. I'm not trying to bash code, I just can't see any rationale in making it a licensing requirement over being able to whistle RTTY as a licensing requirement. The HF vs VHF/UHF/SHF has little to do with it. As has been pointed out before, the ITU makes no statement about how fast one must be able to communicate via code. 1 WPM would meet the treaty requirement. And dropping the code requirement from the treaty is apparently already a slated topic for debate at the next meeting. If the ITU drops the code requirement, do you feel the U.S. should maintain it?

As for "respect". I don't buy the argument, but even if it holds true for any portion of the population, what says the effort needs to be in the form of learning morse code? Why not require the submission of 100 SWL reports as some countries require. Certainly would require some effort, and would be a much better introduction to the hobby than spending hours with SuperMorse. Might even make for better operating practice provided the SWL reports aren't from 14.313. :-)

73,
Todd

N9MWB Who beat the first car he bought into the ground.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #85
